

On Bounded-Weight Error-Correcting Codes*

Russell Bent, Michael Shear, Lane A. Hemaspaandra, and Gabriel Istrate

Department of Computer Science

University of Rochester

Rochester, NY 14627

June 1, 1999

ACM Subject Codes: H.1.1, E.4

Abstract

This paper computationally obtains optimal bounded-weight, binary, error-correcting codes for a variety of distance bounds and dimensions. We compare the sizes of our codes to the sizes of optimal constant-weight, binary, error-correcting codes, and evaluate the differences.

1 Introduction

One goal of coding theory is to construct classes of codes having optimal size. Studies have investigated versions of this problem for classes of codes with various regularity properties, such as linear codes over finite fields [Bro], binary self-dual codes [CPS92], mixed binary-ternary codes [BHOS97], and various classes of spherical codes [Slo].

Two such important cases concern determining the values of $A(n, d)$ and $A(n, d, w)$, where $A(n, d)$ is the number of codewords in the largest binary code of length n having minimum distance d , and $A(n, d, w)$ is the number of codewords in the largest binary code of length n , minimum distance d , and weight w . Optimal values for $A(n, d)$ and $A(n, d, w)$ have been tabulated by Litsyn, Rains, and Sloane [LRS] and Sloane and Rains [RS], respectively.

It is conceivable that significant improvements in optimal code size could be obtained by relaxing the restriction on the code weight in the definition of $A(n, d, w)$ from “equal to w ” to “upper-bounded by w ,” because there would then be a greater number of words potentially

*Supported in part by NSF grants 9322513, 9513368/DAAD-315-PRO-fo-ab, 9701911, and 9815095/DAAD-315-PPP-gü-ab. Email: {rbent, mshear, lane, istrade}@cs.rochester.edu.

available for inclusion in the codes. We present optimal, bounded-weight, binary, error-correcting codes for a variety of distance bounds and dimensions. The method we employ to obtain the optimal codes is based on the observation that finding optimal bounded-weight codes can be transformed to finding the size of a maximum clique in a suitably defined graph. The clique-finding is accomplished primarily using the branch and bound search used in Brouwer et al. ([BHOS97], see also [AJ] and the discussion later in this paper).

2 Preliminaries

Let F be some finite set of characters—the *alphabet*. A word of length n over F is an element of F^n . A code over F of size n is a set of words of length n over F . A code over the alphabet $\{0,1\}$ is called *binary*. Throughout this paper, we use the alphabet $F = \{0,1\}$.

The distance, d , of a code is the smallest Hamming distance between any two codewords in the code. If we have two codewords, x and y , both of length n , we can represent these two words as $x_1x_2x_3 \cdots x_n$ and $y_1y_2y_3 \cdots y_n$, where x_j is the j^{th} bit in x . The Hamming distance between x and y is the size of the set, $\{j : 1 \leq j \leq n \wedge x_j \neq y_j\}$. The weight, w , of a binary word, x , is equal to the number of 1s in x . For a constant-weight (w) code, every word in the code has the same weight, w . In a bounded-weight (w) code, every word has at most w ones.

The standard reduction of finding optimal values of $A(n, d)$ and $A(n, d, w)$ to the problem of determining a maximum clique in a graph is as follows. The graph's vertices represent binary strings of length n (and legal weight, when appropriate). Two vertices are joined by an edge if and only if their Hamming distance is at least d .

It is easily seen that the connection between optimal code size and maximum clique in a suitably constructed graph carries over to the case of bounded-weight codes, and we indeed use exactly that in this paper.

3 Results and Discussion

The constant-weight bounds, many tight, tabulated by Sloane were obtained from a variety of sources and methods [RS]. An elegant method for finding optimal codes of constant-weight is to use an algebraic formula. Methods of creating such formulas for certain cases are presented in Brouwer et al. [BSSS90]. No such algebraic formulas for

instances of bounded-weight codes are available yet. In the absence of such a method we tried various other methods for obtaining good sets of codewords. Many of the algorithms used were bounded-weight variants of those suggested in the literature for calculating good constant-weight codes. These methods included simulated annealing [EHSW87], genetic algorithms [VAvL93], and a randomized greedy heuristic search. The codes generated by these methods were beaten or equaled by our final method of obtaining codes, which was creating an appropriate graph and seeking a large (in fact, usually maximum-size) clique via different clique-finding algorithms.

Since the problem of finding a maximum clique in a graph has been thoroughly investigated [JT93], it is natural to use a reduction to this problem as our basis for finding good bounded-weight codes. The reduction is accomplished by creating the graph of possible codewords acceptable under the parameters for length and weight. Each possible codeword is represented by a vertex in the graph. If two codewords have a proper Hamming distance, then an edge is placed between them. The largest clique in the graph is representative of a maximum set of codewords such that the set meets all the parameters.

We used two clique-finding algorithms suggested in Brouwer et al. [BHOS97]. The first algorithm is a basic branch and bound search. In the worst case, it will search all possible combinations of nodes for cliques, but in practice it keeps track of a best solution and travels only those paths that have the potential to beat the current best solution. This algorithm will always find a maximum-size clique. We used a publicly available coding by Applegate and Johnson ([AJ], see also [CP90]). The second algorithm is a variant of semi-exhaustive greedy search. This algorithm may not always find the largest clique. The algorithm begins by creating two sets of nodes. The first set is nodes that are part of the clique being created and the second set is nodes that can be added to the clique set without disrupting the clique property of the set. This available node set initially contains all the nodes and the clique set is initially empty. A node is chosen from the nodes in the available set. Those nodes that are not connected to the chosen node are eliminated from the available set. This process is repeated until the number of nodes in the available set drops below a user-defined threshold, y . Once y is reached, the branch and bound algorithm is employed on the available set. The nodes are selected as follows. For a user-defined number x , x nodes are chosen at random from the available node set. The node with the most edges in the set of x nodes is chosen. We used a publicly available coding, originally by Johnson, as modified by Applegate and Johnson ([AJ], see also [JAMS91]). For our purposes, good results were achieved when $x = 0.1s$, where s is the number of nodes in the original graph, and $y = 100$. We ran the

algorithm a thousand times in order to increase the odds of finding the largest clique.

The branch and bound algorithm was used on parameters where the optimal constant-weight code sizes were known and the search spaces were small enough to allow results to be obtained in reasonable amounts of time. For example, it took forty-one CPU minutes to calculate $A(9, 4, 4)$ and this was considered reasonable. On the other hand, the calculation of $A(9, 4, 7)$ was terminated as it was taking an unreasonable amount of time. However, running the greedy algorithm one thousand times on $A(9, 4, 7)$ took just under seventy two CPU minutes.¹

From our results, it is now clear that, with regards to changing from constant-weight to bounded-weight, there is little or no increase in number of codewords in the best code until constant-weight codes become handicapped with a decrease in search space. (As the weight of a constant-weight code increases, the search space increases initially, but then begins to decrease once $w > \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. However, in the case of bounded-weight codes, the search space continues to increase as w approaches n .) It is important to note that where there are increases in the number of words in bounded-weight codes over constant-weight codes, these new bounded-weight codes can often be obtained trivially. For example, if $w \geq d$, a bounded-weight code can be created by taking the constant-weight code at $A(n, d, w)$, $w \geq d$ and adding the word of all 0s. This is because the word of all 0s has a Hamming distance at least d from all the words in the constant-weight code $A(n, d, w)$, when $w \geq d$. Other bounded-weight codes can be created in this manner by patching together known constant-weight codes.

Clearly, a lower bound for bounded-weight codes is

$$\max_{m: 0 \leq m < d} \left(\sum_{j: 0 \leq j \leq w \wedge (j \equiv m \pmod{d})} A(n, d, j) \right).$$

Results from the two clique-finding algorithms seem to usually merely meet this bound, and occasionally (see discussion below) beat it. Tables 1, 2, and 3 illustrate these results. It must be noted that the performance of the semi-exhaustive search has only been tested on those parameters where the entire graph can be created and stored in memory. It remains to be seen if patched codes can be matched or beaten easily in other cases.

We now discuss more broadly our results. As noted above, in most cases the best bounded-weight codes we obtain are in fact such that codes of optimal sizes are also provided by “patching together” existing optimal constant-weight codes. However, this does not mean

¹These CPU times were obtained using a Sun Ultra 10.

Length	Weight	Constant	Bounded
6	3	4	4
6	4	3	4
6	5	1	4
6	6	1	4
7	3	7	7
7	4	7	8
7	5	3	8
7	6	1	8
7	7	1	8
8	3	8	8
8	4	14	15
8	5	8	15
8	6	4	16
8	7	1	16
8	8	1	16
9	3	12	12
9	4	18	19
9	5	18	19*
9	6	12	19*
9	7	4	19*
9	8	1	20*
9	9	1	20*
10	3	13	13
10	4	30	31*
11	6	66	71*

Table 1: Distance 4. Note: The values superscripted with “★” were obtained through greedy search.

Length	Weight	Constant	Bounded
8	4	2	2
8	5	2	2
8	6	1	2
8	7	1	2
8	8	1	2
9	4	3	3
9	5	3	4
9	6	3	4
9	7	1	4
9	8	1	4
9	9	1	4
10	4	5	5
10	5	6	6
10	6	5	6
10	7	3	6
10	8	1	6
10	9	1	6
10	10	1	6
12	6	22	23*

Table 2: Distance 6. Note: The value superscripted with “★” was obtained through greedy search.

Length	Weight	Constant	Bounded
8	5	1	2
8	6	1	2
8	7	1	2
8	8	1	2
9	5	2	2
9	6	1	2
9	7	1	2
9	8	1	2
9	9	1	2
10	5	2	2
10	6	2	2
10	7	1	2
10	8	1	2
10	9	1	2
10	10	1	2
11	5	2	2
11	6	2	2
11	7	2	2
11	8	1	2
11	9	1	2
11	10	1	2
11	11	1	2
12	5	3	3
13	5	3	3
14	7	8	8*

Table 3: Distance 8. Note: The value superscripted with “ $\star$ ” was obtained through greedy search.

that that part of our paper makes no contribution. Before our paper, it remained possible that there existed bounded-weight codes for these cases having size larger than the patched-together codes. Our paper, via in many cases (namely, in all table lines other than the nine superscripted with asterisks) establishing the maximum size achievable by *any* legal code obeying parameters, removes this possibility. Additionally, our work shows that in some cases the obvious patching together that we mention does not achieve a maximum-sized code. For example, the case $A(4, 8, 6)$ is of this sort.

We now turn to the question of whether, in light of our results, bounded-weight codes seem wise to use. Bounded-weight codes obviously give no fewer codewords (in a maximum-sized code) than their sister constant-weight codes. Our tables show that in many cases they give strictly more words. Of course, as w increases beyond $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ the size of the word-space of bounded-weight codes becomes extremely rich relative to that of constant-weight codes (which starting at weight $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ have contracting word-spaces as w increases), and even for smaller (but nonzero) values of w their word space is of course richer—which is exactly what opens up the possibility of larger-sized codes.

However, this does not necessarily mean that it is wise to use bounded-weight codes. As our results show, even maximum-sized bounded-weight codes give scant improvement over their sister constant-weight codes, at least in the range— $w \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ —in which the bounded-weight codes don’t have a prohibitively unfair advantage in search-space size. Indeed, in this range, the increase in code size we found is disappointing, and as our codes in this range are all maximum-sized, this disappointment reflects the actual, optimal state of such codes. Additionally, there is a huge cost in adopting bounded-weight codes. In particular, the deepest direct advantage of constant-weight is that their weight provides an extra type of error detection. Bounded-weight codes sacrifice this extra line of protection.

However, as a final comment, we mention that maximum-sized codes may have potential future uses in alternate models of computation/communication. Though this is currently hypothetical, it is not entirely implausible. Consider for example some future alternate model of information (storage or) transmission—perhaps biological, perhaps electrical, perhaps something else—in which each (stored or) transmitted “word” has n binary “bits” (which might be represented via genetic material, or via charged particles in a given location, or so on) but such that, due to constraints of the (storage or) transmission medium, if more than w of the bits are “on” there is the possibility that the information in the word will degrade, or that the computer or transmission lines will incur physical damage. Possible reasons might include power limitations, heat dissipation, or attraction between biological components. In this admittedly extremely hypothetical setting, bounded-weight codes might play a valuable role, as their limitation would be exactly suited to the physical constraints imposed by the (storage or) transmission medium.

References

- [AJ] D. Applegate and D. Johnson. Available from <ftp://dimacs.rutgers.edu/pub/challenge/graph/solvers>.
- [BHOS97] A. Brouwer, K. Hamalainen, P. Ostergard, and N. Sloane. Bounds on mixed binary/ternary codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-44(1):1334–1380, January 1997.
- [Bro] A. Brouwer. Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes. <http://www.win.tue.nl/math/dw/voorlincod.html>.

- [BSSS90] A. Brouwer, J. Shearer, N. Sloane, and W. Smith. A new table of constant weight codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-36(6):1334–1380, November 1990.
- [CP90] R. Carraghan and P. Pardalos. An exact algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 9:375–382, 1990.
- [CPS92] J. Conway, V. Pless, and N. Sloane. The binary self-dual codes of length up to 32: A revised enumeration. *J. Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 60(2):183–195, 1992.
- [EHSW87] A. El Gamel, L. Hemachandra, I. Shperling, and V. Wei. Using simulated annealing to design good codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-33(1):116–123, 1987.
- [JAMS91] D. Johnson, C. Aragon, L. McGeoch, and C. Schevon. Optimization by simulated annealing: An experimental evaluation—Part II, graph coloring and number partitioning. *Operations Research*, 39(3):378–406, 1991.
- [JT93] D. Johnson and M. Trick, editors. *Cliques, Coloring and Satisfiability: Second DIMACS Implementation Challenge*, number 26 in DIMACS series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science. A.M.S., 1993.
- [LRS] S. Litsyn, E. Rains, and N. Sloane. Table of nonlinear binary codes. Available at <http://www.research.att.com/~njas/codes/And>.
- [RS] E. Rains and N. Sloane. Table of constant weight binary codes. Available at <http://www.research.att.com/~njas/codes/Andw/>.
- [Slo] N. Sloane. Available from <http://www.research.att.com/~njas/>.
- [VAvL93] R. Vaessens, E. Aarts, and J. van Lint. Genetic algorithms in coding theory: A table for $A_3(n, d)$. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 45(1):71–87, August 1993.

A Appendix: Codes

<u>A(6, 4, 3)</u>	<u>A(8, 4, 4)</u>	<u>A(8, 4, 8)</u>	<u>A(9, 4, 6)</u>	<u>A(9, 4, 9)</u>
000111	00000000	00001111	000000000	000000000
011001	00111100	00110011	001101010	001101010
101010	01011010	01010101	010101100	010101100
110100	01101001	01101001	011000110	011000110
<u>A(6, 4, 4)</u>	10010110	10010110	100111000	100111000
000000	10100101	10101010	000001111	000001111
010111	11000011	11001100	000110011	000110011
101011	00110011	11110000	101001100	101001100
111100	01010101	00011000	101000011	101000011
<u>A(6, 4, 5)</u>	01100110	00100100	001011001	001011001
000000	10011001	01000010	111010000	111010000
011110	11001100	10000001	110100010	110100010
111001	00001111	10111101	010011010	010011010
100111	11110000	11011011	110001001	110001001
<u>A(6, 4, 6)</u>		11100111	011100001	011100001
000000			100010110	100010110
001111			001110100	001110100
110011	<u>A(8, 4, 5)</u>	<u>A(9, 4, 3)</u>		111111011
111100	00000000	000000111		
<u>A(7, 4, 3)</u>	00111100	000011001		
0000111	00111100	000101010		
0011001	11011000	001001100		
0101010	11100100	100010100		
0110100	01001101	100100001		
1001100	01010110	011000010		
1010010	01110001	011000001		
1100001	10001110	010100100	<u>A(9, 4, 7)</u>	<u>A(10, 4, 3)</u>
<u>A(7, 4, 4)</u>	10001010	110001000	000000000	0000000001
0000000	10010101	001110000	001101010	0000101010
0101011	10110010	010010010	0001001100	0000110100
0110101	00011011	011000110	010101100	0001001100
1011001	00100111	010000110	011000110	1100000100
1101100	11000011		100111000	1001100000
1110010		<u>A(9, 4, 4)</u>	000001111	0101000010
1000111	<u>A(8, 4, 6)</u>	000110011	000110011	0011010000
0011110	00001111	000000000	101001100	0110100000
<u>A(7, 4, 5)</u>	01010101	001101010	101000011	1010001000
0000000	00110011	010101100	001011001	0100011000
0101101	01010101	011000110	111010000	1000010010
1010101	01100011	100111000	011100010	
0110011	10010110	011000011	110100010	
0011110	10101010	110100000	010011010	
1001011	11001100	110100010	100100101	<u>A(10, 4, 4)</u>
1100110	11110000	010011010	010010101	0000100111
1111000	00011000	010011001		0010110001
<u>A(7, 4, 6)</u>	00100100	011100001		0010101010
0000000	01000010	100010110		0000011110
0001111	01111110	001110100		0011000011
0110011	10000001	100100101		0001011001
0111100	10111101	010010101		0001101100
1010101	11011011			0001110010
1011010	11100111			0010001101
1100110		<u>A(9, 4, 5)</u>	<u>A(9, 4, 8)</u>	1000110100
1101001		000000000	000000000	0110010010
<u>A(7, 4, 7)</u>		001101010	001101010	1000010011
0000000	<u>A(8, 4, 7)</u>	010101100	010101100	0100010101
0001111	00001111	011000110	011000110	1001000101
0110011	00110011	100111000	100111000	1010011000
0111100	01010101	000001111	000001111	0100111000
1010101	01101001	000001111	000110011	1000101001
1011010	01101001	000110011	101001100	1010000110
1100110	10010110	101001100	101000011	1011100000
1101001	10101010	101000011	001011001	0110100100
<u>A(8, 4, 3)</u>	11001100	111010000	111010000	0100001011
00000001	11110000	110100010	010010101	0101100001
00101010	00011000	010011010	111000010	1001001010
00110100	00100100	110000010	010010101	0111001000
01001100	01000010	010011010	110001001	0101000110
01010010	01111110	011100001	011100001	0000000000
01010010	10000001	100010110	001110100	1110000001
01010010	10111101	001110100	100100101	1101010000
10011000	11011011	001110100	110100101	0011010100
10000110	11010011	010010101	010010101	1100100010
11100000	11100000	010010101	111011111	1100001100

<u>$A(11, 4, 6)$</u>	<u>$A(8, 6, 4)$</u>	<u>$A(10, 6, 7)$</u>	<u>$A(9, 8, 7)$</u>
00110111010	00000011	0000000000	000000001
00001111110	11110000	0111101100	111111100
00101110011	<u>$A(8, 6, 5)$</u>	1010100111	<u>$A(9, 8, 8)$</u>
10101111000	00000001	1100111010	000000000
10111100010	01111100	1011011001	111111110
10011011010	<u>$A(8, 6, 6)$</u>	0101010111	<u>$A(9, 8, 9)$</u>
10000111011	00000000	<u>$A(10, 6, 8)$</u>	000000000
00011101011	11111100	0000000000	011111111
01011110010	<u>$A(8, 6, 7)$</u>	1101100011	<u>$A(10, 8, 5)$</u>
01001111001	00000000	1001111100	1111100000
10011110001	01111110	1110011010	0000000111
00010111101	<u>$A(8, 6, 8)$</u>	0110101101	<u>$A(10, 8, 6)$</u>
10010110110	00000000	0011010111	0011111110
00011010111	01111111	<u>$A(10, 6, 9)$</u>	1100010000
11001101010	<u>$A(9, 6, 4)$</u>	0000000000	<u>$A(10, 8, 7)$</u>
10101001011	000000011	0001111110	1111111000
11010111000	110010100	1110001110	0111010101
10010100111	001111000	1011101001	0000010110
00111011001	<u>$A(9, 6, 5)$</u>	1100110011	<u>$A(10, 8, 8)$</u>
10001011101	000000111	<u>$A(10, 6, 10)$</u>	0000000000
10110101001	101110100	0000000000	1111111100
11011001001	110011001	0000111111	<u>$A(10, 8, 9)$</u>
10110010011	0110101010	0111000111	0000000000
10101010110	<u>$A(9, 6, 6)$</u>	1110110001	0111111110
11010100011	000000000	1101101010	<u>$A(10, 8, 10)$</u>
10011101100	111111000	1011011100	1111100000
01101011010	001110111	<u>$A(12, 6, 6)$</u>	0000011111
10010001111	110001111	010010111100	<u>$A(11, 8, 5)$</u>
11000011110	<u>$A(9, 6, 7)$</u>	011100101001	11111000000
10100101110	000000000	001000011111	00100101110
00100011111	111110001	011001110010	<u>$A(11, 8, 6)$</u>
10110011100	011101110	011110000110	00000000011
00111001110	100011111	001011100101	00011111100
11111010000	<u>$A(9, 6, 8)$</u>	11010010001	<u>$A(11, 8, 7)$</u>
11011000110	000000000	000110110011	11111000000
11110001010	111111000	100011010110	00000100110
11100011001	<u>$A(9, 6, 9)$</u>	000000000000	<u>$A(11, 8, 8)$</u>
11100110010	000000000	101100110100	00001111111
01011011100	001111110	000101101110	11110110001
10111000101	111001101	010011001011	<u>$A(11, 8, 9)$</u>
10100110101	110110011	100001111001	00001111111
01111000011	<u>$A(10, 6, 4)$</u>	010101010101	11110110001
11010010101	000000111	110111100000	<u>$A(11, 8, 10)$</u>
01100101011	0001110001	100110001101	00000000000
01001001111	0110010010	110100011010	00111111110
01000110111	1010100100	111001001100	<u>$A(11, 8, 11)$</u>
00110100111	111111000	001111011000	00000000000
11000101101	<u>$A(10, 6, 5)$</u>	101101000011	00011111111
01010101110	1111000001	101010101010	<u>$A(12, 8, 5)$</u>
11101100001	0001011101	<u>$A(8, 8, 5)$</u>	000000000111
01100000000	000000000	00000111	011100011000
00001100000	000111111	11111000	100011110000
00000000011	1101001000	<u>$A(8, 8, 6)$</u>	<u>$A(13, 8, 5)$</u>
10000001000	<u>$A(10, 6, 6)$</u>	00000011	0000000000111
00010010000	1111000001	11111100	0111000101000
11100000111	0001011101	<u>$A(8, 8, 7)$</u>	1000111100000
01100111100	1000110011	00000101	<u>$A(14, 8, 7)$</u>
01111101000	0110011010	11111010	10010100111100
01011100101	1100101100	<u>$A(8, 8, 8)$</u>	11100011101000
11001110100	0011100110	00100001	01101110010100
00101101101	<u>$A(10, 6, 6)$</u>	11011110	00110110100011
01110110001	0000000000	<u>$A(9, 8, 5)$</u>	11001100001011
01110001101	1111001100	000000111	10011011010010
01101100110	0011010111	111110000	00111001001101
01110010110	1100100111	<u>$A(9, 8, 6)$</u>	01000001110111
11110100100	1001111010	000000111	
11101001100	0110111001	111110000	